

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/365,066	07/30/1999	JOSEPH FRUTUOSO	5053-23300 1321	
7590 03/29/2004			EXAMINER	
ERIC A STEPHENSON			NGUYEN, NGA B	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	E & TAYON PC			
P O BOX 398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 787670398			3628	
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/365,066	FRUTUOSO ET AL.
navicory motion	Examin r	Art Unit
	Nga B. Nguyen	3628
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	-	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in f the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below):
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an wor appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-8,10,12-15,17-27,29-34,36 ar</u>	nd 38-62.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		
10. Other:	HY	UNG SOUGH IY PATENT EXAMINER
		OGY CENTER 3600



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new feature added to the claims 1, 13: "translating at least one outgoing transaction into a computer data format decipherable by a receiving trading partner transaction processing software" requires examiner performs further consideration and seach.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Walker does disclose the at least one business rule comprises one or more logical operators and a string of at least one keyword and at least one operator because in Walker's the legal language is pulled from contract detail database 280 which stores a plurality of paragraphs, these paragraphs are linked together with the above elements to form a complete CPO, thus it is obvious that a paragraph is a string of at least one keyword and at least one operator. Moreover, In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).